DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 332 EA 007 968

AUTHOR Talmage, Harriet; Ornstein, Allan C.
TITLE School Superintendents' Attitudes Toward Community Participation in and Control of Curriculum and Related School Management Issues.
PUB DATE 22 Apr 76
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, April 19-23, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Advisory Committees; *Attitudes; Community Control; *Community Involvement; *Curriculum; Decision Making; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Management; *Minority Groups; Personnel; *School Superintendents; Statistical Analysis

ABSTRACT

Superintendents' attitudes toward community participation in and control of curriculum issues in relation to the current demands for a broad base in school decision-making are examined. It is hypothesized that superintendents will differ in their attitudes on participation and control in four areas of school decision-making. Certain characteristics of the school system will influence these attitudes. The attitudes of superintendents in systems of 15,000 or over were obtained using a 40-item instrument. Statistically significant differences were observed between attitudes on community participation and community control and attitudinal differences associated with size of school system and school setting (city/suburban). (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED119332

SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN AND CONTROL OF CURRICULUM AND RELATED SCHOOL MANAGEMENT ISSUES*

Harriet Talmage
Professor of Education
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

and

Allan C. Ornstein
Professor of Education
Loyola University, Chicago

Presented at the 1976 American Educational Research Association Conference, Division B, San Francisco, California.

Session #23.15

EA 007 968

*The investigators would like to acknowledge the assistance of Sue Pinzur Rasher, Office of Evaluation Research, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, who served as computer consultant and programmer.

SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN AND CONTROL OF CURRICULUM AND RELATED SCHOOL MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Identifying the locus of authority and defining the decision making roles fill an extensive portion of the literature in school administration. In a study of 51 school districts, McCarthy and Ramsey noted that school board members serve as representatives of special interest groups and for self-interests, and that these motivations affect the behavior of their respective superintendents.(1) Minor studied the decision making relationship between boards of education and superintendents in surburban communities and found that school boards in middle and upper middle class communities permitted superintendents more latitude in making decisions about the schools than those in working class communities. School boards were also likely to give administrators wider decision making latitude in communities where there was relatively little conflict.(2)

In Gross's 1958 landmark study on pressures that influence decision making among superintendents and school board members in Massachusetts, it was found that out of a list of 19 groups the parents or the PTA were the most influential and welfare organizations were least influential.(3) Ten years later Gittell and Hollander studied six urban school systems (Baltimore, Chicago, Detroit, New York, Philadelphia, and St. Louis) and concluded there was little community input in these systems; minority community interests were least served.(4) The same year Crain made a similar observation in his study of eight urban school systems /Baltimore, Buffalo, Newark, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, St. Louis, Bay City and Lawndale (the last two cities, somewhere in New England and somewhere in the west respectively, were given pseudonyms)/. Although the school boards represented various racial, ethnic, and religious groups, they did not represent lower class interests.(5)

With the push toward participatory democracy, black and Latino power, decentralization, responsiveness to ethnic differences and other movements to broaden the schools' decision making base, the demand for community participation at the advisory and control levels threatens established sources of school decision making. By the late 1960's the concept of black power appeared on the urban scene, and with it evolved demands for greater policy-making input from poverty and minority groups -- including community control. Recent studies by La Noue and Smith of six urban school systems (Detroit, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and Washington, D.C.)(6) and Ornstein(7) of 18 large and medium size school systems in both cities and suburbs indicate that welfare, anti-poverty, and minority groups are now active and influential in major school systems across the country and that the issues concerning community participation have reached emotional and disruptive proportions in urban areas which have large black and/or Latino populations.

For the greater part, the recent discussion on community participation and especially community control have been based on commentary and have employed a highly subjective analysis.(8) Clark refers to the literature on these twin subjects merely as "special pleading for a particular solution..., little attempt is made to develop ideas coherent enough to warrent the term 'theory,' and the casual use of favorable examples seldom justify the label of empirical knowledge."(9) Coinciding with this lack of empirical data to the present, little by way of factual information seems to exist concerning the attitudes of school superintendents toward community participation at either the advisory or control levels.

Purpose and Design of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the degree to which superintendents are willing to include a broad sector of the community in decisions related to various aspects of school management. The study assumed that community involvement in school decisions entailed the forfeiture of some decision making power ordinarily lodged in the superintendent's office. It was hypothesized that superintendents' attitudes toward community advisement differed significantly from their attitudes toward community control; advisement relates decision making to inputting suggestions while control implies direct decision making power.

A second hypothesis was tested regarding differences between attitudes toward community advisement and control on specific areas of curriculum and related school management issues. Some areas are traditionally regarded as solely within the superintendent's domain; some areas are traditionally regarded as shared responsibilities. Four areas of decision making were selected for study: curriculum; student affairs; school finances; and personnel. Inasmuch as certain areas are perceived as central to the maintenance of power, participation at the control level would upset the traditional role of superintendents more than participation at the advisory level.

It was further hypothesized that certain variables affect the superintendents' attitudes toward community participation within the four school management areas. The independent variables selected for study included: (1) size of the school system; (2) the geographic setting; (3) ethnic composition of the school; (4) geographic location; and (5) type of community involvement practiced in the school.

Superintendents' attitudes toward community participation (advisory and control), the dependent variables, were measured on the Community Participa-

tion - Community Control Attitudinal Inventory. The 40-item instrument (see appendix) generated two total scores or scales, one for advisement and the other for control. Both yielded four subscores or subscales based on attitudes on curriculum, student affairs, finances, and personnel. Table 1 identifies the items within the scales.

Definitions

The community. The community was defined as a cluster of adults who reside in the local school district, who are concerned about educational issues, who are willing to voice their concerns, and who may or may not have children presently enrolled in the local school.

Community advisement. Advisement entails the opportunity for community members to participate in school management issues by giving suggestions and advice to the superintendent.

Community control. Control entails decision making opportunities that will determine school policy.

Method

The names of school districts with student populations of over 15,000 were obtained from the Educational Directory: 1972-1973 (Public School Systems) published by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1973. A letter of explanation and an accompanying inventory were sent to the 399 school districts in the United States and Puerto Rico in the 15,000 or over size category. Of these, 232 inventories were returned (i.e., 58.1%). Although the percent of returns is less than desired, the returns by geographic location (east: 16.1%; midwest: 22.3%; southwest: 10.9%, south: 28.0%; and west: 22.7%)are proportional to the actual number of school districts with populations over 15,000 in each area.(10) Of the 232 returned

inventories, 215 were usable for data analysis.

In addition to the 40 items which constitute the inventory, Part III of the instrument elicited background information about the superintendents and their school districts. Data on two of the seven independent variables were not used in the analyses: sex of respondents and ethnicity of respondents. There was only one female respondent and too few minority superintendents to include these variables in the study. Both instances are indicative of the composition of superintendents in school systems over 15,000, as of 1973, and not due to a lack of representativeness of the sample.

Table 2 shows the independent variables and their values used in the analyses of data. In the cases of size of school system, geographic setting, ethnic composition of school system, and type of community involvement practiced, the original values obtained were collapsed and new categories were used in the analyses.

Internal consistency of the two parts of the inventory, participation in terms of advisement and control, applying the Spearman-Brown formula computed with z transformations, were $r = .97$ for advisement and $r = .95$ for control.(11)

To test the hypotheses concerning differences in superintendents' attidues toward community participation (advisement compared to control), and differences in attitudes on the four school management areas, t-tests were performed. F-tests were used to determine the effects of geographic location and type of community involvement practiced in the school system on attitudes toward participation and control. To determine the relationships between the values of the independent variables, size of school system (15,000 to 49,999 and over 50,000), school setting (suburban and city) and ethnic composition of the school district (predominantly white and predom-

inantly minority) and the superintendents' attitudes defined by the 10 scales in the inventory, Pearson correlation coefficients were obtained. A stepwise multiple regression procedure was used to further analyze the amount of variance accounted for by three independent variables (size of system, ethnic composition, and school setting).

Results and Discussion

It was observed that superintendents as a group held significantly more favorable attitudes ($p<.001$) toward community involvement in school issues when it was advisory in nature than when involvement implied power to determine issues. Significant differences were also obtained between superintendents' attitudes toward advisement and control on the four school management areas ($p<.001$ for each t-test statistic). Table 3 summarizes the means, standard deviations, t-values, degrees of freedom and probability levels. It should be noted that the higher the mean scores the less positive are the attitudes toward involvement by community members in school issues. On each of the 10 attitude scales, the mean scores indicated that superintendents' attitudes did not preclude some community involvement, both in terms of advisement and control. However, there were significant differences in the degree to which superintendents supported participation as advisement ($\bar{X} = 51.325$) compared to participation as control ($\bar{X} = 60.818$). In both the attitudes toward community advisement and control, the superintendents were more amenable to having the community involved in school finance issues than in the other three issues. Also on both advisement and control, the superintendents indicated less positive attitudes toward community involvement in personnel questions than in the other areas.

Curriculum issues. The attitudes are highly favorable toward community participation in advising on the development of the school's educational

objectives (item #7; $\bar{X}$ = 1.642) and least favorable toward community advisement role related to implementing the curriculum (item #16; $\bar{X}$ = 2.772). The same holds for community control on these two curriculum issues (item #27; $\bar{X}$ = 2.327 and item #36; $\bar{X}$ = 3.202). Implementation is associated with personnel prerogatives, therefore the negative attitudes on items #16 and #36 are consistent with the superintendents' responses to items on personnel issues.

Personnel issues. These issues have been zealously guarded by school administrators in the past. They have been protective of their rights to recruit new faculty, determine their fitness (evaluation), and to determine matters on promotion and tenure. The item mean scores bear this out (see Table 4). It is of interest to note that the superintendents did not distinguish between the community's involvement in personnel matters related solely to teachers and those items on personnel matters related to both teachers and administrators.

Student affairs issues. Superintendents held strong attitudes on the items related to student affairs. They were most amenable to community advisement and control on matters related to reporting student progress (items #13 and #33) and least favorable to community involvement in student policy matters related to grouping students in classes (items #4 and #24). Once again community participation appeared to infringe on personnel prerogatives.

Finance issues. Generally the superintendents held more favorable views toward community involvement in financial matters than in the other three areas. In the past the community has held varying levels of decision making power on school repairs, local tax issues, per pupil expenditure and new construction. The mean scores of item #9 and item #29 (participation in deciding local taxes) support the view that the community's input

on this issue is recognized. Spending money for school repairs (item #3 and #23) was least favorably perceived as a community concern in comparison to the other items on school finances.

Recently, many state and federal guidelines for preparing proposals to obtain public funds have insisted on community participation in the proposal development stage. Administrators appeared more reluctant to involve the community in questions concerning proposal development at this point in time than in questions regarding local taxes, construction of new school buildings, and per pupil expenditures.

Probing further to determine the independent variables that may have bearing on the superintendents' attitudes, 20 analyses of variance were performed, ten related to geographic location (east, midwest, southwest, south, and west) and attitudes toward community advisement and control; and ten anova related to type of community involvement (traditional organizations, community advisory councils, action groups, and others). No significant Fs were observed. The attitudes of the superintendents responding to the study did not differ significantly on advisement and control based on the geographic location of the school districts or based on the type of community involvement presently practiced in their schools. Hence, it appeared that geographic location and present community involvement practices do not signifcantly affect superintendents' attitudes.

The relationships between size of the school districts and attitudes on community advisement and control, between geographic setting and attitudes on advisement and control, and between ethnic composition of the schools and advisement and control were tested using Pearson correlations. Table 5 reports the correlation coefficients.

Significant correlation coefficients were observed between the superintendents' attitudes toward community advisement in curriculum decisions

and the size of the school system ($r = -0.228$; $p<.01$), between student affair issues and size ($r = -0.245$; $p<.01$), between personnel issues and size ($r = -0.186$; $p<.05$), and on overall advisement and school system size ($r = -0.229$; $p<.01$). Negative correlations mean that the larger the school system the less favorable the superintendents' attitudes were toward community advisement generally and specifically on issues related to curriculum, student affairs, and personnel issues. However, for community control, the attitudes of superintendents from large school districts (over 50,000) were positively correlated with school finances ($r = 0.138$; $p<.05$). The positive correlation indicated that superintendents from large districts were more favorably disposed to their community's active involvement in matters related to school finance than were superintendents from systems below 50,000.

Signficant correlations were also observed between the school setting (suburban/urban) and advisement on student affairs ($r = -0.143$; $p<.05$) and between the school setting and advisement on school finance ($r = 0.137$; $p<.05$). Superintendents of systems located in the suburbs held more favorable attitudes toward community advisement in student affairs than superintendents of city systems. By contrast superintendents of city systems were more positive in their attitudes toward community control of school finances than their suburban counterparts. The latter finding tends to substantiate the La Noue and Ornstein studies that indicated increased involvement of community members from cities with large non-white populations in school management during the late 1960's.

There were no significant correlations between ethnic composition of the school system and the superintendents' attitudes on the five advisement and five control attitude scales.

To further study the amount of variance that school size, ethnic composition, and school setting account for in the attitudes of superintendents

toward community participation in curriculum student affairs, finances, personnel issues and total participation, stepwise multiple regression equations were computed.(12) The analyses indicated that only a small amount of the total variance in superintendents' attitudes was due to school system size, ethnic composition, and school setting. A large amount of the variance was unaccounted for in the independent variables selected for study.

Typically independent variables such as size, geographic location and setting, and ethnic composition of a system have been used as a basis for studying attitudes. Although the Pearson correlations were observed to be significant in a number of instances, the data do not go far enough in explaining the attitudes superintendents held on community advisement and control. Other variables need to be explored in order to understand the basis for the attitudes administrators hold.

Summary and Conclusion

Superintendents surveyed in this study were not opposed to some degree of community participation but were more favorably disposed to community advisement than to community control. The superintendents, regardless of the variables related to characteristics of the system or community, held favorable attitudes on advisement on many curriculum and school finance issues. In the areas of student affairs and personnel, the superintendents were less favorably disposed to participation even on the advisory level. Superintendents, as a group, took a less favorable position on community control. On control of school finances, they favored some voting power delegated to the community. On curriculum and student affair issues, they tended to delegate much less voting power to the community than on school finance issues. The least favored attitude toward community control concerned personnel issues. Attitudes tended to differ among superintendents

according to the system size and the school setting in specific school management issues. While these differences were significant, regression analyses indicated that a large amount of the variance was not accounted for in the regression equations. Other factors require examination, particularly factors unique to local school situations and to factors operating within the school's social system.

These findings may be telling the researcher that school systems, regardless of such commonalities as size, ethnic composition, geographic location are unique social systems. The superintendent as he functions within a given social system relates and reacts to a host of local issues and interrelated variables that override any effects of size, location, and ethnic composition. Nonetheless, citizens around the country want to be involved in their schools. During 1974, the Commission on Educational Governance under the auspices of the National Committee for Citizens in Education held public hearings around the country to explore issues related to the question: "Who controls the public schools?" Decision making in public schools emerged as a central issue.(13) In responding to the community for involvement in making decisions, therefore, the superintendent would do well to understand his own attitudes, study the particulars of his own school system, and together with the community members work to establish a process for extending areas in which the community can be constructively involved in making decisions. It is imperative that administrators identify areas in school management that community persons can participate in both at the advisory and control levels. A number of such school management issues were identified in this study and may well become the basis for community involvement in the public schools in those areas that are not deemed too sensitive or too threatening initially. This could serve as a "foot in the door" for future constructive collaboration between superintendents and their community.(14)

FOOTNOTES

1. McCarthy, Donald J., and Ramsey, Charles E. The School Managers: Power and Conflict in American Public Education. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Publishers, 1970.

2. Minor, David W. Education Decision-Making in Suburban Communities. Cooperative Research Project No. 2440. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1966.

3. Gross, Neal. Who Runs Our Schools? New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958.

4. Gittell, Marilyn, and Hollander, T.E. Six Urban School Districts: A Comparative Study of Institutional Response. New York: Praeger, 1968.

5. Crain, Robert L. The Politics of School Desegration. Chicago: Aldine Press, 1968.

6. La Noue, George R., and Smith, Bruce. The Politics of School Decentralization. Lexington, Mass.: D.C.Heath, 1973.

7. Ornstein, Allan C. Metropolitan Schools: Administrative Decentralization vs. Community Control. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1974.

8. A highly favorable position is taken by Mario D. Fantini, Marilyn Gittell, and Richard Magat in Community Control and the Urban School. New York: Praeger, 1970. A highly negative position is taken by Allan C. Ornstein in Race and Politics in School/Community Organizations. Pacific Palisades, Ca.: Goodyear, 1974.

9. Clark, Terry. "On Decentralization." Polity, 2, 1970, 509-514.

10. Geographic distributions, as obtained from the Directory: east: 12.5%; midwest: 20.0%; southwest: 13.1%; south: 29.7%; and west: 22.7%.

11. Five significant factors emerged from a varimax rotated factor analysis: three from participation as advisement responses and two from the control responses. Advisement factor 1 included all personnel items (the highest loading) with an eigenvalue of 9.0. Advisement factor 2 included most of the curriculum and student affairs items for an eigenvalue of 1.1. Control factor 1 included all the personnel items and several curriculum and student affairs items (those most closely associated with personnel). The eigenvalue for control factor 1 was 11.3. Control factor 2 was difficult to interpret since items from each of the four attitude subscales were represented.

    Face validity and significant Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficients ($p<.001$) between community participation as advisement and community control, and between each of the four areas of school management, justified assigning specific items to the four areas. On this basis the four areas were used as the factors in the data analyses.

12. The other two independent variables (geographic location and type of community involvement practiced in the system) were not entered in to the regression equation. The values of these variables could not be dichotomized in to meaningful values.

13. Weinstein, Shelly, and Mitchell, Douglas E. (eds.). Public Testimony on Public Schools. National Committee for Citizens in Education. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1975.

14. A model for involving community members and school personnel in meaningful dialogue is presented in: Talmage, Harriet. "Evaluation of Local School/Community Programs: A transactional Evaluation Approach." Journal of Research and Development in Education, 8:3, Spring 1975, 32-41.

TABLE 1. CLASSIFICATION OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION - COMMUNITY CONTROL ATTITUDINAL INVENTORY ITEMS BY SCALES AND SUBSCALES

SUBSCALES	COMMUNITY ADVISEMENT	COMMUNITY CONTROL
Curriculum	1, 7, 10 14, 16	21, 27, 30, 34, 36
Student Policy	2, 4, 8 11, 13	22, 24, 28 31, 33
Finances	3, 5, 9 18, 20	23, 25, 29 38, 40
Personnel	6, 12, 15 17, 19	26, 32, 35 37, 39
TOTAL SCALES	all the above	all the above

TABLE 2. SUMMARY OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

AND THEIR VALUES

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	VALUES
Size of school system	1 15,000 to 49,999 2 over 50,000
Geographic setting	1 suburban 2 city
Ethnic composition of school system	1 predominantly white 2 predominantly minority
Geographic location	1 east 2 midwest 3 southwest 4 south 5 west
Type of community involvement in system	1 traditional organizations: PTA, mothers' clubs 2 established community advisory councils 3 action groups organized around special issues 4 other

TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF DEPENDENT VARIABLES' STATISTICS AND TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE

VARIABLE	$\bar{X}$	SD	T	df	2-tail Probability
CURRICULUM					
Participation	11.651	2.731	11.76	211	0.001
Control	14.604	3.434			
STUDENT POLICY					
Participation	13.521	3.015	11.22	210	0.001
Control	16.062	3.153			
FINANCES					
Participation	10.746	2.842	8.76	208	0.001
Control	13.057	4.046			
PERSONNEL					
Participation	15.540	3.647	8.04	210	0.001
Control	17.303	3.148			
TOTAL					
Participation	51.325	10.573	10.76	202	0.001
Control	60.818	12.285			

TABLE 4. ITEM MEAN SCORES* BY SCHOOL ISSUES

CURRICULUM						STUDENT POLICY					
Advisement			Control			Advisement			Control		
Item	$\bar{X}$	SD	Item	$\bar{X}$	SD	Item	$\bar{X}$	SD	Item	$\bar{X}$	SD
1	2.223	0.695	21	3.028	0.861	2	2.497	0.778	22	3.140	0.861
7	1.642	0.702	27	2.327	1.037	4	3.089	0.785	24	3.486	0.676
10	2.260	0.654	30	2.902	0.825	8	3.019	0.779	28	3.315	0.765
14	2.724	0.841	34	3.178	0.744	11	2.837	0.753	31	3.308	0.717
16	2.772	0.797	36	3.202	0.741	13	2.126	0.847	33	2.765	0.896
	2.324			2.927			2.714			3.203	
FINANCES						PERSONNEL					
3	2.730	0.810	23	3.154	0.924	6	3.172	0.866	26	3.528	0.667
5	2.402	0.876	25	2.995	0.884	12	3.037	0.880	32	3.467	0.676
9	1.581	0.756	29	1.944	1.145	15	2.977	0.887	35	3.427	0.708
18	1.813	0.740	38	2.380	0.991	17	3.181	0.779	37	3.484	0.670
20	2.237	0.899	40	2.570	1.080	19	3.191	0.835	39	3.430	0.727
	2.367			2.609			3.116			3.467	

*Advisement Scale
1.000 = in all cases
2.000 = in many cases
3.000 = in some cases
4.000 = in no cases

Control Scale
1.000 = majority vote
2.000 = equal vote
3.000 = minority vote
4.000 = no vote

TABLE 5. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN COMMUNITY ADVISEMENT AND COMMUNITY CONTROL ATTITUDES AND THREE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Issues	ADVISEMENT			CONTROL		
	Size	Setting	Ethnic Composition	Size	Setting	Ethnic Composition
Curriculum	-0.228**	-0.062	0.019	0.016	0.038	0.044
Student Policy	-0.245**	-0.143*	-0.072	-0.076	-0.020	-0.044
Finances	-0.065	0.016	0.010	0.138*	0.137*	0.075
Personnel	-0.186*	-0.098	-0.057	-0.062	0.016	0.014
Total	-0.229**	-0.084	-0.029	0.013	0.051	0.032

** indicates $p < .01$
* indicates $p < .05$

APPENDIX

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION - COMMUNITY CONTROL ATTITUDINAL INVENTORY

The questions on the inventory are being used to obtain factual information about the views school superintendents have toward community participation and community control. The community is defined as a cluster of adults who reside in the local community and who are concerned about educational issues but who may or may not have children presently enrolled in the local school.

There are three parts to the inventory. Part I is concerned with your attitudes about community PARTICIPATION in school affairs. Part II is concerned with your attitudes about community CONTROL of school affairs. Part III is concerned with data on your background which may correlate with responses in Part I and Part II.

Part I: COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Directions: Part I contains 20 statements. For each of the 20 statements below, indicate your response to the question--- TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD COMMUNITY MEMBERS PARTICIPATE IN THIS AREA? Indicate your responses using in the space provided the following symbols:

A = in all cases
B = in many cases
C = in some cases
D = in no cases

____1. Advise on matters related to evaluating the curriculum.

____2. Advise on matters on student discipline.

____3. Advise on matters related to spending money for school repairs.

____4. Advise on matters on grouping students in clases.

____5. Advise on matters related to preparing state and federal proposals.

____6. Advise on matters related to recruiting teachers when vacancies exist.

____7. Advise on matters related to developing the school's education objectives.

____8. Advise on matters on disagreement between students and school personnel

____9. Advise on matters related to determining local taxes for schools.

____10. Advise on matters on formulating new courses.

____11. Advise on matters on testing students.

____12. Advise on matters on evaluating the fitness of teachers, ppincipals, and superintendent (s).

____13. Advise on matters on reporting student progress.

____ 14. Advise on matters on selecting books from an approved list.

____ 15. Advise on recruiting teachers, principals, and superintendents when vacancies exist.

____ 16. Advise on matters related to implementing the curriculum.

____ 17. Advise on matters on evaluating the fitness of teachers.

____ 18. Advise on matters related to building new schools.

____ 19. Advise on matters related to tenure and promotion of school personnel (teachers, principals, superintendent(s).

____ 20. Advise on matters related to expenditures per student.

Part II: COMMUNITY CONTROL

Directions: Part II contains the same 20 statements as in Part I. For each statement indicate your response to the question--TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD THE COMMUNITY CONTROL POLICY IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS? Indicate your response using in the space provided the following symbols:

A = majority vote
B = equal vote with school personnel
C = minority vote
D = no vote

____ 21. Determine matters related to evaluating the curriculum.

____ 22. Determine matters of students discipline.

____ 23. Determine matters related to spending money for school repairs.

____ 24. Determine matters grouping students in classes.

____ 25. Determine matters related to preparing state and federal funds.

____ 26. Determine matters related to recruiting teachers when vacancies exist.

____ 27. Determine matters related to developing the school's educational objectives.

____ 28. Determine matters on disagreement between students and school personnel.

____ 29. Determine matters related to determining local taxes for schools.

____ 30. Determine matters on formulating new courses.

____ 31. Determine matters on testing students.

____ 32. Determine matters on evaluating the fitness of teachers, principals, and superintendent(s).

____ 33. Determine matters on reporting student progress.

____ 34. Determine matters on selecting books from an approved list.

____ 35. Determine matters on recruiting teachers, principals, and superintendent(s) when vacancies exist.

____ 36. Determine matters related to implementing the curriculum.

____ 37. Determine matters on evaluating the fitness of teachers.

____ 38. Determine matters related to building new schools.

____ 39. Determine matters related to tenure and promotion of school personnel (teachers, principals, superintendent(s).

____ 40. Determine matters related to expenditures per student.

PART III: BACKGROUND DATA

Directions: Select the appropriate response.

41. Respondant's sex
    a = female
    b = male

42. Ethnicity of respondant
    a = Black
    b = Spanish surname
    c = White
    d = Other

43. Size of School System
    a = 15,000-24,999 students
    b = 25,000-49,999 students
    c = 50,000-74,999 students
    d = 75,000-99,999 students
    e = 100,000-or more students

44. Setting of school system
    a = Predominantly rural
    b = Predominantly suburban
    c = Predominantly city

45. Ethnic composition of the school system
    a = Predominantly black
    b = Predominantly Spanish surname
    c = Predominantly white
    d = Predominantly another ethnic group
    e = No predominant ethnic group

46. Geographic location of school system
    a = East (northeast, central coast)
    b = Middle West (central states)
    c = South West
    d = South (southeast and south central)
    e = West (northwest and west coastal)

47. Degree of present community particiaption in school system
    a = Community input through the traditional school organizations (PTA, mothers club, etc.)
    b = Community input through established community advisory councils.
    c = Community input through groups organising action of specific issues.
    d = Other types of input (little input)
    e = Other types of input (substantial input)